

[13th September 1958]

(4) REMOVAL OF DISPARITY IN SCALES OF PAY OF HIGHER GRADE  
TEACHERS IN VARIOUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

\* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Sir, I move—

“ This Council recommends to the Government that the disparity in scales of pay as among the Higher Grade teachers in the various elementary schools under the various agencies in the State be removed.”

I may tell hon. Members that this Resolution is for the removal of disparity by upgrading. Now, hon. Members may well remember that some three years ago—in 1955—I had occasion to bring before this hon. House a Resolution for the removal of disparity in the scales of pay for various kinds and grades of teachers serving in various institutions and under different agencies in this State. An assurance was given on that occasion that the disparity would be removed and I withdrew my Resolution. But provision was made in the Budget for only one category of teachers, viz., secondary grade teachers, and disparity as among the secondary grade teachers serving in the various schools under different agencies was removed. But suddenly a few months back, a new order was issued, perhaps on account of the huge cost involved, stating that secondary grade teachers who newly entered service and who taught only classes 1 to 5 in elementary schools should be paid a lower scale of pay. So, somehow or other, they have brought in the disparity again.

Now, this Resolution, hon. Members may note, is brought in on behalf of the teachers called higher grade teachers. Higher grade teachers are teachers who have qualified themselves by passing the E.S.L.C. (Eight Standard Public Examination) or who have failed in the S.S.L.C. course or passed some Form between the III and the V Forms and have undergone teacher training for full two years in institutions approved by the Director of Public Instruction. So, besides their general qualification, all of them have had teacher's training for two years. These teachers number about 75,000 to-day in our so-called shrunken State. After the separation of Kerala and Kanara, there are 75,000 teachers called higher grade teachers and they come under five categories, which can be more appropriately called five different castes. What are these castes? They are, Government higher grade teachers, district board higher grade teachers, municipal higher grade teachers, panchayat higher grade teachers and private or aided school higher grade teachers. So, these 75,000 teachers are treated by a Government which claims to be secular, as belonging to five different castes. It is more than eleven years since we got Swaraj and nobody knows the reason why the Government keep them under these five categories. We have no quarrel with the Government if they keep them under five denominations or categories or castes, but there is a lot of difference in pay on account of such treatment.

Sir, this agency system crept in in the days of the Britisher and there is no reason why a national Government should perpetuate this system. Perhaps it is financially advantageous to the Government of the day. The Government teacher gets the highest salary.

13th September 1958] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

The municipal and the district board teachers get a little lower salary. The private or the aided school teacher gets the lowest salary. The panchayat school teacher cannot be classified under any of these for the reason, as I have submitted on the sacred floor of this House many times, that he is treated as Markandeya for all purposes—not in respect of life. His salary is not paid properly and he is never given any increment. I do not know why the Government have put all these schools under the control of panchayats.

(Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

A higher grade teacher under Government gets a scale of Rs. 30—1—50. The district board and the municipal higher grade teachers get the same Rs. 30 as starting salary, get the big increment of one rupee annually and go up to a maximum of Rs. 45 as against Rs. 50 which their brother Government teacher gets. The aided school teacher starts on Rs. 30, gets a beautiful increment of annas eight per year and stops with Rs. 33. His brother teacher in the Government school goes up to Rs. 50 and in the local board school goes up to Rs. 45. But this poor teacher has to stop at Rs. 33 only. In six years, earning an increment at the rate of Re. 0-8-0 a year, he reaches the maximum of Rs. 33. Sir, out of the 75,000 teachers coming under this category of higher grade teachers more than 50,000 belong to the aided schools. So, 50,000 families are starved by a national Government, which claims to rule this State in the name of the Father of the Nation and with the objective of driving poverty out of this land. These 50,000 teachers get Rs. 17 less than the teachers with the same qualification, serving in Government schools.

Sometimes, Sir, the argument has been advanced from the Treasury Bench on the sacred floor of this House that the teachers in Government schools ought to get a little more because they are liable to transfer from place to place. But are they transferred everyday? Is transfer a reason for increase in the salary by Rs. 17 per month? Will any elementary school teacher incur by a transfer such a large amount of expense calculated at the rate of Rs. 17 per month? Nobody can admit that. Even taking that argument for granted . . .

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What is your point? Is it that the salary of teachers drawing Rs. 50 should be reduced to Rs. 33 or that the salary of those drawing Rs. 33 should be increased to Rs. 50?

\* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, that is why I have submitted, at the very outset, that this Resolution is for levelling up of the salaries and removal of disparities by upgrading. In fact, that was my first sentence after moving my Resolution, that the disparity in the scales of pay as among the higher grade teachers in the various elementary schools under the various agencies in the State be removed.



[Sri G. Krishnamoorthy] [13th September 1958]

The aided school teacher gets only Rs. 33. Taking the argument of transfer, what about the teacher in the municipal elementary school? If at all he is transferred, he is transferred within the municipal limits and not out of the town. He goes up to Rs. 45 instead of Rs. 33 which his brother teacher in the aided institution gets. What about the district board teacher? He is tossed from one end to the other end of the district. But this district board teacher also gets only Rs. 45 as against Rs. 50 allowed to the teacher under Government management, who is liable to transfer once in two or three years. All people know that the district board teacher is transferred from one end of the district to another and that the reason of transfer does not count in his case. So, the argument that Government teachers are given a higher pay because they are liable to transfer cannot stand.

Let me impress upon all the hon. Members the fact that all the teachers have the same general qualifications prescribed by the Government. They have the same general educational qualification. They all have come out of the same training schools established by the Government. The boys they are handling are the same, namely, the Indian children. The syllabus prescribed by the Department of Public Instruction, Madras, and which they are handling is the same. The schools are inspected by the same Inspectors, the Government authorities. In spite of the oneness in these things, they are treated as different by the Government ruling under a Constitution which speaks of equality of opportunities, equal pay for equal work and opportunity for those who are handicapped. What reason is there for the Government to perpetuate these things? Is it a matter of finance? If it is a matter of finance, many projects could be stopped, at least the projects which are not connected with the production of food. It is not a question of finance. It is a question clearly of want of mercy on the part of the Government, want of will on the part of the Government. If the Government will not accept these, then there can be only one reason, that is, the Government will not understand this problem. But I cannot understand the argument that they cannot understand the miseries of the teachers.

I can go on cataloguing the miseries of these teachers. This starting salary of Rs. 30 which goes up to Rs. 33 is not even equal to Rs. 7-8-0 of the olden days with the present cost of living index at 400 points. The increment of half a rupee which is to be given to him if his service is unblemished and satisfactory not only to the managements but the parents also and the Deputy Inspector of Schools, is not even worth Re. 0-2-0 of the olden days. If the teacher who is the moulder of the nation, whom the Nation wants to produce individuals to protect the hard-won freedom is to be paid only Rs. 7-8-0 of the old type and Rs. 30 of the present type, is it proper on the part of the Government or on the part of the Nation? Can there be any party politics in this? Is not a teacher expected

13th September 1958] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

to be above party politics? Are not all children to be treated alike by the teacher? Is there the question of Opposition or Treasury Bench in this matter? It is a matter pertaining to the whole Nation and the hon. Members of this House are interested in the welfare of the Nation. If at all there are parties, it is only to see that the welfare reaches the people a little quicker. So, hon. Members, wherever they may be seated, will be one with me in this House that the moulder of the Nation who is expected to produce individuals who will be mentally, physically and spiritually equipped for the hard task of preserving the freedom won hard by the Father of the Nation and in whose name this Government is ruling, should be contented and they should support the Resolution and see that the moulder of the Nation is paid at least a living wage.

Sir, we were waiting and waiting for salvation. The First Five-Year Plan, we thought, would bring us some salvation. Not a pie was given to us under that Plan. The Second Five-Year Plan came afterwards. We thought that something would be given to us at least by way of a living wage. Under this Plan also nothing was given. We have been fighting for house-rent allowance, and removal of discrimination in the case of teachers of one particular category, namely, teachers in the aided institutions. Government in their various reports have accepted that the aided school teachers have done the most efficient work but in spite of that, they do not want to loosen the strings of their purse in favour of these teachers who are losing their all, sacrificing their all in the cause of the nation. Somehow or other, the Government think that because the teachers are subjected to a monthly meeting wherein the Deputy Inspector arrives and the teachers are subjected to his control at the meeting, they are servile people and won't get up. But if there is a person like Krishnamoorthy, naturally he feels that it is his duty, his social duty and considers it to be the greatest piece of social work to see that if the future citizens are to be handled properly and with full attention, those in charge of them get a living wage. It is my firm conviction that the first charge on the revenues of any civilized Government must be education. Though it is eleven years since we got Swaraj, this question of removal of disparity in scales of pay which may cost the Government not even a few lakhs of rupees has been there before the Government. Is it not the duty of the Government to come forward and say: 'Well, Krishnamoorthy, somehow or other due to our pre-occupations, we forgot to amend this. It is but proper that persons with the same qualifications, same general qualifications, technical qualifications, handling similar classes, handling the same syllabus and inspected by the same officer should be paid at least the same salary'?

I would request hon. Members to note that this Resolution does not aim at increasing the wages. It aims at only the removal of disparity: it aims at the removal of discriminatory treatment which is a great sore. I would like to submit that this disappointment



[Sri G. Krishnamoorthy] [13th September 1958]

4-40  
P.M.

works hard and if teachers are discontented today, it is only on account of this differential, Cinderella treatment given to them. As an hon. Member has already spoken, even from the time of the late Rt. Hon. Sastry, it has been said that the teachers belonging to the Government schools are Government's children, that the teachers under local bodies are Government's step-children and that the teachers in private schools are nobody's children. That is the case even to-day after so many years and so many decades. Is it not but proper on the part of the Government to say, 'Well, it is a slip on our part. On account of our pre-occupations we did not amend it. We accept your Resolution.'? It is, after all, to remove the discriminatory treatment. Can a Government professing to do their work in the name of the Father of the Nation allow this discrimination to go on? Can a Government working under the Constitution which speaks of equal pay for equal work and equality of opportunities to all say that because he is in a particular institution, though he has the same qualification, he must not get the same pay as others? Instances are not wanting when the Government pointed out to us at the time of deputations, 'Well, that is all the lot of the people. See the clerks in the Secretariat. See the clerks in the Ministerial Service. The former are placed better than the latter. So, it is a man's luck.' Sir, I would humbly submit to the Government that in the case of the teachers it is not the case. Even if he is an M.A., L.T. or a B.A., L.T., he has to draw the scale of Rs. 75-5-145 or Rs. 85-5-125-10-175. Beyond that, he cannot expect in his life even if he be a man of merits. But in the case of the clerical service, there is no end to promotion. If there is dearth of men during war, there will be chances of promotion. It may be their luck. But here, in the case of the teacher, no war and no peace can help him. He is fixed to a certain rate and this rate of Rs. 30-1-50 in the case of the Government school higher grade teacher should be applicable to all higher grade teachers. I put this one question to the Treasury Benches. 'Are these teachers in the aided schools not doing national work?' What work are they doing? They are educating the children. Whose children are they? They are the nation's children and children of the people in India. How is the Government run? The Government is run with funds. Who supply the funds? It is the people that supply the funds. So, the Government, if at all they give, give only people's money. For what purpose are they going to give it? For the removal of disparity. It is for the purpose of seeing that the teacher there gets at least the satisfaction, though not increased wages, that he gets a pay similar to the pay got by a friend of his in Government service. Can there be any difference between a Government school and an aided school so long as the Government recognize that it is a school recognized by the department, so long as the Government say that that school should be run on departmental lines and subject to departmental regulations and so long as they say that the school will get grant only if approved by their Deputy Inspector or the District Educational Officer? It is the lookout of the Government to satisfy the agent

13th September 1958] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

The Government is the principal. The School Manager is the agent. Why should the poor teacher who gets into that school suffer simply on account of the denomination of the school and simply because it is called a private school run by an agent? Why should the teachers in the district board schools also suffer simply because they are called local self-Government schools? This removal of disparity is an urgent need. It has to be done in the name of justice and in the name of equity. It has to be done by the Government in order to guard themselves against the charge that they have been giving discriminatory treatment to the teachers.

After all, this is a question costing a few lakhs of rupees. Our Government are getting sixty crores of rupees a year. The Government may at once come forward and say, 'Well, Krishnamoorthy, you gave out so many figures, Rs. 30— $\frac{1}{2}$ —33. What about the dearness allowance we pay? What about the Rs. 12 increase we paid recently?' Certainly, the teachers are getting the dearness allowance of Rs. 18 and the Rs. 12 recently sanctioned. But what did our Government do when giving that Rs. 12 enhanced dearness allowance? In the case of teachers in high schools it has been treated as dearness allowance, but in the case of elementary schools, it has been classified into two fashions, the first fashion being called additional special pay and the second being called dearness allowance. I do not know what made the Government do so. I do not know whether it was done in order to get a Central grant. Subject to correction, it may be the reason. Or, perhaps they thought that they would be giving additional six rupees as pay. But this additional pay does not come under 'Pay'. It is not to be taken into account by the Government authorities for purposes of increment, provident fund and pension. Though it is embellished in very liberal terms as 'special additional pay', it has not got the effect of even the last word 'pay'. The purpose of my Resolution is removal of disparity. This Resolution is not for grant of enhanced scale; it is not about the payment of Rs. 18 or Rs. 12 which has been paid to the Government teacher, local board teacher and aided school teacher also. But what about this disparity? It still continues. A Government school teacher gets a maximum of Rs. 50 plus Rs. 22 plus Rs. 12, but this man gets only Rs. 33 plus Rs. 18 or Rs. 19 plus Rs. 12. There is this disparity, disparity in the scale and disparity in the amount actually received by him. The difference of Rs. 17 is there, in spite of what the Government have claimed to have granted recently. I am not speaking about the question whether this amount will be sufficient for his livelihood. If I speak about that, it will be a tale of sorrow. The teacher will have a big family. This Rs. 33 has not got the purchasing power as much as Rs. 8 in olden days. He cannot buy food, clothes and books for his children. Even supposing education is free at all stages—it is not free at all stages; only recently it has been made free up to the S.S.L.C. stage—what about feeding and clothing of the children? How can the teacher sit in the class with shrunken eyes? How can he set a model to the pupils?



[Sri G. Krishnamoorthy] [13th September 1958]

Is he there to be in a shrunken stage, without even a square meal? He has to do the task of moulding the future nation. Especially in independent India, I am really sorry that I have to plead the cause of 50,000 families to get a pittance of Rs. 17 by way of removal of disparity. This Rs. 17 is not equal to Rs. 4 of the past. So, I would request hon. Members to kindly consider this question, view this as an all-Party question, a national question, a question affecting the future generation, a question that is concerned with their own children who are considered as darlings of Bharata Bhoomi, and support me fully so that this discriminatory treatment which has somehow or other been allowed to persist all these eleven years since the dawn of freedom may not be allowed to continue but may be just put an end to by the Government.

**SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR :** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Government of Madras recently sanctioned a sum of Rs. 12 to the teachers. But there is the disparity in the scales of pay between the Government teacher and the aided elementary school teacher. The Government who are very sympathetic towards the teachers should pay special attention to this matter of removing this disparity. We should guarantee equal pay for equal work. The difference is a pittance of only Rs. 17. So, the Government should specially consider this question and remove the disparity.

**\* SRI M. PATANJALI SASTRY :** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Resolution of the hon. Member is a modest one. It only asks for removal of disparity in the scales of pay of the Government school teacher and the aided elementary school teacher. I have always wondered how an elementary school teacher getting a pay of Rs. 33 could carry on his work of moulding the future generation of citizens efficiently. He would have his own domestic troubles. He would have to meet the pestering demands of his wife and children. With what enthusiasm could he handle the little children in their formative years? It has always appeared to me to be a great task. But, somehow or other, in this country this state of affairs has gone on. I wish that it does not continue and that this disparity is removed soon. I give my wholehearted support to this Resolution.

4-50  
p.m.

**\* VIDWAN T. MUTHUKANNAPPAN :** மேல் மன்றத் துணைத் தலைவர் அவர்களே, இப்பொழுது கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஸ்ரீ கிருஷ்ணமூர்த்தி பேசியதை யொட்டி நானும் கொஞ்சம் பேசுவதாக இருக்கிறேன். நான் ஒரு ஆசிரியர் குலத்திலே — ஆசிரியர் குடும்பத்திலே — பிறந்தவன். என்னுடைய சுற்றத் தார்களிலே அத்தனை பேரும் ஆசிரியர்கள். நான் ஒரு தொடக்க நிலைப் பள்ளியில் ஆசிரியராக 6, 7 ஆண்டுகள் பணியாற்றியிருக்கிறேன். அந்த நிலையிலே ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்கள் படுத் துன்பங்கள் எவ்வளவு, அவர்கள் படுத் துயரங்கள் எவ்வளவு, என்பதை நான் நன்றாக அறிந்திருக்கிறேன். இந்த பாரத புண்ணிய பூமியிலே உயர்ந்த தமிழ் நாட்டிலே, யாராவது இன்றைக்கு மிக மிகத் துன்பத்தை அனுபவிக்கும் நிலையில், துயரை அனுபவிக்கும் நிலையில் இருக்கிறார்களென்றால், அவர்கள் ஆரம்பப்பள்ளி ஆசிரியர்கள்தான் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்.

13th September 1958] [Vidwan T. Muthukannappan]

மேலும், ஆரம்பப் பள்ளி ஆசிரியருக்கு 30 ரூபாய் தொடக்கத்தில் சம்பளம். சாதாரணமாக 18-வது; 20-வது வயதில் இந்த ஆசிரியர் பணியை மேற்கொள்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் 55-வது, 60-வது வயது வரை வேலையில் இருக்கலாம். ஆக 42 ஆண்டுகள் பணி செய்த பிறகு, கடைசியாக 33 ரூபாய் சம்பளம் வாங்குகிறார் என்பதை நினைக்கும்போது, மிகவும் கேவலமாக இருக்கிறது. இந்த அவலநிலையை மறக்கமுடியாது, மறுக்க முடியாது, மறக்க முடியாது. இத்தகைய கேவலமான நிலை தொடக்கப்பள்ளி ஆசிரியர்களுக்கு, ஆரம்பப்பள்ளி ஆசிரியர்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்றால், அது நமது நாட்டு ஆசிரியர்களுக்கே மாசு தேடுவதாக இருக்கிறது.

மேலும், மாணவர் உலகம் நன்றாக இல்லையென்று நினைக்கிறார்கள், சீர்கேடைத்திருக்கிறது என்று நினைக்கிறார்கள், சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இதற்கு மூல காரணம் என்ன என்பதை ஆராய்ந்தால் தெரியும். தொடக்க நிலைப் பள்ளி ஆசிரியர்களுக்கு உணவு, உடை, உறைவிட வசதிகள் சரியாக இல்லாத காரணத்தினால்தான், அவர்களிடத்தில் பயிலும் மாணவர்களும் சரியாக இல்லாமலிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு உண்ணை நல்ல உணவிலலை, உடுக்க நல்ல உடையிலலை, இருக்க சரியான உறைவிடமில்லை. இவர்கள் இத்துடன் எப்படிப் போய் 40, 45 மாணவர்களுக்குச் சொல்லிக்கொடுப்பார்கள்? அவர்கள் நிலை அவலமான நிலையாக இருந்து வருகிறது.

அரசாங்கப் பள்ளிகளுக்கும், தனியார் பள்ளிகளுக்கும், ஜில்லா போர்டு பள்ளிகளுக்கும், வேறு வேறு படி இருப்பது நன்றாகயில்லை. ஒரே தரமாக இருப்பதே நல்லது, ஒரே முறையாக இருப்பது நல்லது, ஒரே நிலையாக இருப்பது நல்லது. ஒரு ஆசிரியர் உயர்ந்த தன்மையுடையவராக இருக்க வேண்டும், உயர்ந்த பண்புடையவராக இருக்கவேண்டும். மாதம் ஒன்றுக்கு 30 ரூபாய் சம்பளத்தை வாங்கிக்கொண்டு எப்படி அவர்கள் கண்ணியமாக இருக்க முடியும்? நல்ல உடைதான் உடுத்த முடியுமா? நல்ல பலவித புஷ்டியான உணவுதான் சாப்பிட முடியுமா? நல்லதன மாகக் குடும்பம் நடத்தவேண்டுமென்றால், முடியுமா? 45, 50 ரூபாய் சம்பளத்தில் எப்படி வாழ முடியும் என்பதை எண்ணிப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். இந்தமாதிரி நிலையோடு கூட, விபரீதமான வேற்றுமை, சம்பளத்தில் வேறுபாடுகள் இருக்கக்கூடாது. அதை அரசாங்கம் முக்கியமாக நன்றாகச் சிந்தனை செய்து, சமத்துவமான சம்பளத்தை ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டுமென்று தாழ்மையோடு கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

\* DR. A. CHIDAMBARANATHAN : கனம் துணைத் தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைப்பற்றி நான் இரண்டு மூன்று சொற்கள் மட்டும் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். திருவாளர் ஜி. கிருஷ்ணமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் இந்தத் தீர்மானச் செய்தியை வெகுவாக ஆராய்ந்து அலசி, வெகு ஆர்வத்துடன் எடுத்துக் கூறினார். அவர் எடுத்துக் காட்டியபடி, ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்களைப்போற்றுவதில் மூன்று படி நிலைகள், 30-1-50, 30-1-45, 30-1-33, இருக்கின்றன. அவர்கள் ஒரே படிநிலையாக அமைத்துத் தாருங்கள் என்று கேட்கிறார்கள். ஆரம்பச் சம்பளத்தை 30 ரூபாயிலிருந்து 45 ஆக ஆக்குங்கள் என்று கேட்டிருந்தால் கூட, நல்லது. தற்காலிகமாகக் கிடைக்கக்கூடியதைக் கேட்கவேண்டாம் என்று அதனைத் தள்ளிப்போட்டுவிட்டு, படி நிலையை ஒன்றாக ஆக்குங்கள் என்று, இதை யாவது ஏற்றுக்கொண்டால், இப்பொழுது நல்லது என்று கேட்கிறார்கள். ஆரம்பச் சம்பளமாக உள்ள 30 ரூபாயை 45 ரூபாயென உயர்த்துவது என்றால், அதிகச் செலவு ஏற்படலாம் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு. ஆனால், ரூ. 30-1-50, ரூ. 30-1-45, ரூ. 30-1-2-33 என்பதை மாற்றியமைத்து எல்லோரும் ரூ. 30-1-50 என்ற விதத்தில் சம்பளம் பெறுமாறு செய்வதால், அதிகச் செலவு ஏற்படாது என்ற நம்பிக்கையில் தான், திருவாளர் கிருஷ்ணமூர்த்தி இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை இந்த விதத்தில் வற்புறுத்தியிருக்கிறார்கள் என்று நம்புகிறேன். இந்தத் தீர்மானம் மிகவும் ஆதரிக்கத் தக்க தீர்மானம். ஏனென்றால் இப்பொழுது பல ஆசிரியர்கள் ரூ. 45-இலேயே பல ஆண்டு காலமாகத் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கிறார்கள். பல



[Dr. A. Chidambaranathan] [13th September 1958]

ஆசிரியர்கள் ரூ. 33-இலேயே தேங்கிக் கிடக்கிறார்கள் பல ஆண்டுகாலமாக இப்போது அரசாங்கம் ரூ. 30—1—50 படி நிலையில் உயர்த்தும்போது என்ன செய்யுமென்றால், 33 ரூபாய் சம்பளம் வாங்கும் ஆசிரியருக்கு 34 ரூபாய்தான் கொடுக்கும்; 30—1—45-இலே, ரூ. 45 சம்பளம் வாங்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கும் ஆசிரியர்கள் எவ்வளவோ பேர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இப்போது அரசாங்கம் 46 ரூபாய்தான் கொடுக்கவேண்டி ஏற்படும். தேங்கிக் கிடக்கும் ஆசிரியர்கள் சம்பளத்தில் தனித்தனி 1 ரூபாய் தான் உயரப் போகிறது. ஒவ்வொரு ஆசிரியருடைய அடிப்படைச் சம்பளத்தையும் 45 ரூபாய் என்று ஆக்கினால் எவ்வளவு செலவாகுமோ, அந்த அளவு செலவாகாத ஒரு திட்டம் என்ற வகையிலே திருவாளர் கிருஷ்ணமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த தீர்மானத்தை முழு மனத்தோடு ஆதரிக்கிறேன். இதற்குச் செலவு என்ன ஆகும் என்று அரசாங்கம் சிந்தித்து உடனடியாக நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு அமருகிறேன்.

\* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have had a most passionate appeal on behalf of teachers, from one who has represented their cause with considerable distinction in this House and outside. It has left an impression, at any rate in my mind, as if the condition of the teachers is worse and most deplorable and nothing in this country is worse than that. I am sure, hon. Members of this House will appreciate that the Government have been doing their very best to improve the lot of teachers in various small ways.

The hon. Member Sri Krishnamoorthy himself acknowledged that since November 1956, the allowances of the teachers have been enhanced to the extent of Rs. 12. We have also introduced a pension system for the teachers in the schools. Whatever is possible under the circumstances, the Government are endeavouring to do. Therefore, I would ask for a little patience on the part of the hon. Member Mr. Krishnamoorthy and others in this matter. If it were only a question of the teachers, certainly the Government would have no difficulty in meeting that particular demand. But we are aware that similar passionate appeals are made by the Non-Gazetted Officers, by the employees in Government industrial undertakings and by almost everybody in Government employment, and the result is that we have to face the problem of finding the requisite finance for meeting these demands. In this connection, the hon. Member Mr. Krishnamoorthy has suggested that we have to cut our developmental expenditure to such an extent as to enable us to pay increased salaries to the teachers. I do not know how the country would accept that alternative solution. In fact, the demand on the resources of the Government is so great from people who are far worse than the teachers, in the villages in the various parts of the country, who want industries to be established for them, roads to be constructed for them and hospitals to be built for them and who are equally passionate in their appeal to the Government, to see that this national Government of theirs do justice to them. Sir, I am only pointing out all these things to show that the Government have to balance all these considerations and that they are endeavouring their best to do justice by each one of those who make this demand on the Government. (Interruption.)

13th September 1958] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

Everybody wants a living wage in this country. Unfortunately, many people do not know that the average *per capita* income of the people of this State is only Rs. 225. So, we have to balance the various demands and see that we do the best with the resources that are available. There is a limit to taxation. It is not as if we can go on increasing taxation to any length and it is not humanly possible in the present context of our economic position, completely to dissolve all the differences in pay scales existing in several sectors of our public undertakings as well as in public life. Sir, the House is also aware that a Committee of the Legislature 5 p.m. has been constituted to advise the Minister for Education on this question of elementary education. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Members to the report of the Committee. On page 46 in paragraph 36, the Committee has said—

“ It will be seen from the statement of provisional allocation of funds for the Second Five-Year Plan period, that a sum of Rs. 322 lakhs is set apart to meet the cost of increase in the pay of school teachers. Out of this sum, Rs. 236 lakhs are intended for teachers employed in Elementary Schools, as well as for teachers of the same grades employed in Secondary Schools (in the primary and middle phases of School Education). The allocation is provisional pending settlement of the following questions :—

(i) To what extent Central Government grants would be forthcoming in order to meet this expenditure;

(ii) whether having regard to (i) and other needs of the Development and Reorganization programmes, the size of the allocation was correct; and

(iii) what is the amount of increase in recurring annual-cost-per-teacher which could be afforded, consistently with the decisions to be taken on the Elementary Education (Intensive Development) Scheme.”

Therefore, I may say, Sir, that the matter is under the active consideration of the Government and that they are trying to see what best could be done to improve the lot of the teachers. I would, therefore, request the hon. Member to give some more time to the Government to formulate a scheme in the light of the recommendations of the Legislature Committee.

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair.)

DR. V. K. JOHN : May I ask, Sir, what is the time required?

\* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Perhaps it will be introduced in the next financial year 1959-60. We have also to decide how much we would get from the Central Government and how much this Government would have to provide for it. The hon. Member Sri G. Krishnamoorthy said that a uniform scale



[Sri R. Venkataraman] [13th September 1953]

of pay should be fixed. I may say that even the Legislature Committee has recommended that there is scope for difference in pay. The Committee has suggested as follows :—

“ We recognise, however, the need for making one general exception to this rule, viz., that reasonable difference can be justified where it is related to liability for transfer over considerable distances from one school to another.”

Therefore, I venture to submit, Sir, that it will not be possible to fix uniform scale of pay, as suggested by the hon. Member. In view of the recommendations of the Legislature Committee referred to above, I would request the hon. Mover of the Resolution to withdraw it bearing in mind that the matter is under the active consideration of the Government.

\* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very, very sorry that the Hon. Minister has not replied to my point. My Resolution here is not for enhanced salaries as stated by him.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: You want a uniform scale of pay. That means enhancement in pay.

\* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: This particular Resolution is for removal of discriminatory treatment which ought to have been done away with voluntarily by a national Government. That is what is involved in this Resolution.

Now, with regard to the cut in developmental expenditure, I am fully for it and the Government are in a position to do it. The Government yet, I am sorry to say, have not considered education as a chief factor in a development plan. The authors of the First Five-Year Plan, the Second Five-Year Plan and the Third Five-Year Plan yet to come, have not recognized this. Unless education is considered a chief factor, the various targets in the various fields in the Five-Year Plans would not be achieved to the extent they are desired to be achieved. Education is an asset which may not be perceptible. It will not be available for demonstration for voting purposes, I say. But it is an asset that is carried on from brain to brain, from generation to generation, from person to person, and from birth to birth. Such a thing which is a cultural heritage of this ancient land where the late Gokhale lived and the late Balagangadhar lived and fought for freedom, has been neglected by a national Government. Even the Father of the Nation lived and fought for freedom and basic education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is going beyond the scope of the Resolution. He must confine himself to the terms of the Resolution.

\* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Education should be the main factor in any development scheme. I had often pleaded on the sacred floor of this House whether the allotment of Rs. 12 crores which was equal to 20 per cent of the total revenues spent by this Government every year on education, could not be reorganized so as to give the maximum benefit to the teachers. But

13th September 1958] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

the Government have not paid any heed to my representation or have not accepted or even repudiated the representation. I have also often suggested that a fund called "Teachers' Maintenance Fund" should be started by the Government. Such a non-official resolution was brought at the time, if I remember aright, when Sri C. Rajagopalachariar was the Chief Minister. I do not know what the Government have done with regard to that. Things can be done, if the Government really will.

Even with regard to the allotment in the Second Five-Year Plan, the proposed allotment of Rs. 38 crores was reduced to Rs. 15 crores and it has been further reduced to about Rs. 12 crores. I would like to know what is allotted every year of the Five-Year Plan and whether it really goes to the teacher. I would like to take pride in repeating my remark that our Government have more faith in brick and mortar than in men and minds. You will find this in the First Five-Year Plan and also the Second Five-Year Plan.

Now, with regard to the recommendation of the Legislature Committee, the only benefit that has been conferred on the teachers of the high schools is that instead of 180 days, they have been asked to work 200 days without any extra pay.

I was very glad to learn from the Hon. Minister that a sum of Rs. 236 lakhs had been set apart to meet the cost of increase in the pay of the teachers employed in elementary schools. The Hon. Minister said that this was a provisional allotment. I would like to know details as to whether this would be allotted in 1959-60 or before the close of the Second Five-Year Plan period. I would humbly submit, as already stated by me, that this Resolution is in no way concerned with the enhancement of salaries claimed by all people who do not get a living wage or a proper wage. This Resolution, I repeat again, is for the removal of the discriminatory treatment as among teachers in aided schools and Government schools, with the same general qualifications and technical qualifications and inspected by the same inspecting authority. Should there be a discriminatory treatment by a national Government which stands for equality of opportunities and equal pay for equal work under the Constitution? This Resolution is nothing but a request to the Government to remove the disparity in the scales of pay of higher grade teachers and this would not cost much to the Government as pointed out by my esteemed colleague, Dr. Chidambaramathan. With regard to the new entrants also, the Government would not be incurring any extra expenditure because they are going to start with Rs. 30. Thus, this Resolution is in no way concerned with enhancement of salaries, but is only for the removal of the discriminatory treatment and if the Hon. Minister cannot convince me about the necessity for the disparity and persists in his view that this discriminatory treatment should be there, I can remark that this Government want to divide and rule as the Britisher did and that instead of the "white bureaucracy", we have now a "brown bureaucracy".



[13th September 1958]

5-10  
p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I now put the Resolution to the vote of the House. The question is—

“ This Council recommends to the Government that the disparity in scales of pay as among the Higher Grade teachers in the various elementary schools under the various agencies in the State be removed ”.

The Resolution was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and vote was taken.

(After the name of Sri M. Ethirajalu was called by the Secretary, Vidwan T. Muthukannappan entered the Chamber.)

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, the hon. Member Vidwan T. Muthukannappan came into the Chamber just now. His name should not be included in the counting.

(Vidwan T. Muthukannappan's name was not included in the counting.)

The House divided thus—

*Ayes.*

Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar.  
“ V. K. John.  
Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar.  
“ V. V. Ramaswami.  
Dr. A. Chidambaramathan.

Sri Mohamed Raza Khan.  
“ L. S. Karayalar.  
“ G. Krishnamoorthy.  
Dr. A. Sreenivasan.

*Noes.*

The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman.  
Sri P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.  
“ M. Ethirajalu.  
“ A. Gajapathy Nayagar.  
“ T. Purushotham.  
“ A. M. Allapichai.  
“ M. Seshachariar.

Dr. Mahomed Usman.  
Srimathi Jothi Vencatachellum.  
“ S. Manjubhashini.  
Sri N. Annamalai Pillai.  
Srimathi Mary C. Clubwala Jadhev.  
Sri V. M. Surendram.

*Neutral.*

*Nil.*

*Ayes—9.*

*Noes—13.*

*Neutral—Nil.*

The Resolution was lost.

(5) CONSTITUTION OF A COMMITTEE FOR THE WELFARE OF WOMEN.

\* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Sir, I move the Resolution standing in my name, namely :—

“ This Council recommends to the Government that a Committee of lady Members of both Houses of the Legislature be constituted to enquire into and report on the social disabilities of women and the social welfare measures to be instituted in this behalf at State level ”.

I feel, Sir, I need not dwell at length upon the merits of this Resolution. I am sure the hon. lady Members behind me will more eloquently put forward the plea for a Resolution of this kind. In